



3643

Responsive Amendment to Application for Patent (09/891,757) on
“An Integrated System For Shellfish Production”
1/31/03 4:24 PM Russell P Davis (757)340-0651
Page 1 of 102

Inventor Name:	Russell Patton Davis
Citizenship:	USA
Inventor Residence and Correspondence Address:	613 Mango Dr., Virginia Beach, VA 23452 Changed to 409 Sea Pointe Court #201 Virginia Beach, VA 23451 757-491-0519 http://www.Shellfish-Unlimited.com Russell_P_Davis@Shellfish-Unlimited.com

RECEIVED
FEB 06 2003
GROUP 3600

Invention:

**AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM FOR SHELLFISH PRODUCTION:
Encompassing Hatchery, Nursery, Grow-out, Brood-stock Conditioning and
Market Conditioning Phases; also Water Treatment, Food Supplement,
Propulsion, Anchoring, Security, and Devices for the Integration of
Neighborhood Values and Shellfish Production.**

Application filing Date:	JUNE 26, 2001 09/891,757
Art Unit: 3643	Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas, Jr. FAX 703-305-7687 V.703-308-2694/Sup. Peter Poon 308-2574



Responsive Amendment to Application for Patent (09/891,757) on
"An Integrated System For Shellfish Production"
1/31/03 4:24 PM Russell P Davis (757)340-0651
Page 2 of 102

RECEIVED
FEB 06 2003
GROUP 200

PROSECUTION HISTORY:

Responsive Claim Amendment: Provisional Election & Claim Prototype FAXed Sept 10, 2002

Request for an additional month to reply Mailed and Faxed on Dec 1, 2002.

Provisional Election & Claim Amendment & Traverse Mailed Sept 16, 2002

Request of an additional month to respond FAXed Dec 2, 2002

Provisional Election & Claim Amendment & Traverse Mailed and Faxed on Jan 2, 2002

Amended Claims, PCT search option suggested with PCT application to become "Continuation-In-Part" mailed on Jan 31, 2002

January 31, 2003, To Examiner Mr. Tom Price:

The complete application 09/891.757 us enclosed with a complete replacement of the claims.

I have not heard anything from you regarding my requests of extension of time. If there is some perceived impediment there I would like to bring your attention to 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) and the prior PTO-2038 with blanket authorizations to charge.

I would also ask you to consider PCT MEP Chapter V131(i) with instruction regarding the "Unity of Invention". It might be simpler and better if the claims under this application (where the linkage to Claim 0 is completed) where resubmitted without Link to Claim 0.

It may also be that the enclosed PCT application that incorporates this unpublished application should be submitted as a "Continuation-In-Part". The quality of writing is much advanced which can make your job easier. You could allow a substitution of disclosure if you found the original to be somewhat informal. Also, under that scenario you could use the search made under the PCT application and your labor would consist mostly of assigning priority dates to claims. Would this please you, Sir?

Respectfully,
Russell P Davis



RECEIVED
FEB 06 2003
GROUP 3600

Responsive Amendment to Application for Patent (09/891,757) of

"An Integrated System For Shellfish Production"

1/31/03 4:24 PM Russell P Davis (757)340-0651

Page 3 of 102

January 2, 2003, Mr. Tom Price: In response to the restriction requirement of 08/26/2003 #3807 and your follow-on correspondence to which I responded with a request for one month delay, the Applicant provisionally elects to traverse the restriction requirement by amending the claims by completely replacing the claims section of the application such that claim 0 is elected and claims 1 through 39 are restated as linked claims.

Yet, the original disclosures are also hard to read and full of grammatical errors. If there has been no competing patent filed in the area of shellfish culture in the interim of pendency there would certainly be no harm in allowing higher quality writing into the Patent record. Can you tell me if such is the case? It may also be that disclosure amendments that do produce additional claims could be allowed. If such is the case the literary qualities of the disclosure could be substantially enhanced.

If there have been no patents (even provisional) on the topic of shellfish culture filed in the interim of pendency of this patent it might be both better and permissible to submerge this patent application within a PCT application of much higher readability and coherence. Is that a possible path to pursue in this patent?

Please bill as needed to meet the required fees. Form PTO-2038 is enclosed

Sincerely,

Russell P Davis



RECEIVED
FEB 06 2003
IGROUP 3600

Responsive Amendment to Application for Patent (09/891,757) on
“An Integrated System For Shellfish Production”
1/31/03 4:24 PM Russell P Davis (757)340-0651
Page 4 of 102

Sept 16, 2002 Mr. Tom Price: In response to the restriction requirement of 08/26/2003 #3807, the Applicant provisionally elects to traverse the restriction requirement by amending the claims by completely replacing the claims section of the application such that claim 40 is elected and claims 1 through 39 are restated as dependant claims. Claims 1 through 39 also link in CLAIM 0.

Given due deference to PTO examination rules contained in MPEP 808.01, the last 39 claims in this invention cannot be subject to restriction requirement and divisional patent as the claimed features of the invented integrated system are not independent inventions but are connected by “*design, operation, and effect*”. There is only one art unit to examine this patent application. Making a restriction requirement based upon the number of coherent benefits claimed is like prohibiting a patent because the invention offers too great an advance in utility to its industry. Certainly, ludism has not been authorized by patent law. Moreover, the examination research required is not a suitable basis for restriction as there is very little or no prior art to research on many of the claimed features. A query of prior patents in shellfish culture will have a very small result set compared to the search of most other industries.

The original disclosures are also hard to read and full of grammatical errors. Please accept this replacement of that section of the application. If that is not possible, I understand. Even so the reading of the predecessor may be less jarring to your senses after reading the included subsequent. The double spacing of the subsequent can also give you space for your notes. Optical character reading software can aid your identification of any material difference in disclosure. There is a follow-on patent of enhancements under PCT in the works that may restate these disclosures in more readable prose. If there has been no competing patent filed in the area of shellfish culture in the interim there would certainly be no harm in allowing higher quality writing into the Patent record. Can you tell me if such is the case? It may also be that disclosures amendments that do produce additional claims could be allowed. If such is the case the literary qualities of the disclosure could be substantially enhanced.

Given my desire to make this patent have more readable prose I would be grateful if you could give me an additional month to respond. Yet, please give me an answer on my request to edit the disclosures as soon as possible. Please bill as needed according to meet the required fees. Forms PTO-2038 & PTO/SB17 are enclosed.

No Attorney or Agent	No Government Agency has any ownership interest in this patent
DECLARATION & Small Entity Election:	I, Russell Patton Davis, am the sole inventor of this “INTEGRATED SYSTEM FOR SHELLFISH PRODUCTION: Encompassing Hatchery, Nursery, Grow-out, Brood-stock Conditioning and Market